




DAVID SANDERS, PH.D.  
Director

**County of Los Angeles**  
**DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES**  
425 Shatto Place -- Los Angeles, California 90020  
(213) 351-5602

April 3, 2006

Board of Supervisors  
GLORIA MOLINA  
First District  
YVONNE B. BURKE  
Second District  
ZEV YAROSLAVSKY  
Third District  
DON KNABE  
Fourth District  
MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH  
Fifth District

TO: Mayor Michael D. Antonovich  
Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky, Chair Pro Tem  
Supervisor Yvonne B. Burke  
Supervisor Gloria Molina  
Supervisor Don Knabe

FROM: David Sanders, Ph.D.   
Director

**MARCH 15, 2005 BOARD AGENDA ITEM #2: HOLLYGROVE AND GROUP HOME  
TRANSITION/RATE CARE SETTING**

At the March 15, 2005 Board meeting, the Board instructed the Director of the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) to:

- Establish a "Children's Group Home Workgroup," in accordance with the "Katie A." settlement, which will consist of representatives from, but not limited to: DCFS, Probation, Mental Health (DMH) and other relevant group home providers and consumers, to develop an array of implementation and transition strategies, including a proposed timeline for implementation, to service children with the goal of stability and permanency.

The Work Group began meeting on April 26, 2005 and DCFS provided a progress report on July 7, 2005. The Work Group was established to assess the need for and the role of group homes in the DCFS, DMH and Probation systems in a time when the goals and outcomes for these systems have been refocused, with a greater emphasis on in-home service provision, and faster permanency for children in out-of-home care.

Since July, the Work Group has collaborated to create a blueprint document, the "Foundation for Los Angeles County's Residentially-Based Services Reform," which summarizes the key elements recommended to govern the County's utilization of group homes in the future. This vision for reform differs from the current system in the



following significant ways: 1) criteria for placement in residential programs based on safety factors and treatment efficacy; 2) an emphasis on the urgent need for family permanency; 3) early engagement of youth and their families as partners in treatment planning; 4) a redefinition of the role of residentially based services as typically an intensive short term intervention focused on returning youth to their families with aftercare services; and 5) increased accountability through robust and meaningful performance measures. (Attachment #1).

Additionally, the Work Group has prepared a report on implementation and transition strategies addressing the changes currently underway in utilization of group homes (Attachment #2). DCFS has expanded home and community based contracted services such as Family Preservation and Wraparound and is encouraging placement agencies to consider business conversion to diversify. DMH is developing new mental health services for youth in foster care and plans to contract for Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC) beds, Multi-Systemic Therapy, Intensive In-Home Services, as well as Full Service Partnership slots.

The Probation Department has implemented a policy to direct youth 14 and younger to group homes and begun piloting Placement Assessment Centers (PACs) at 2 group homes to conduct comprehensive assessments in 30 days. DCFS has developed a Placement Level Assessment process utilizing a standardized instrument at contemplation of placement into a group home and upon moving from a group home. DCFS, DMH and Probation are examining the different screens and assessment instruments utilized across systems with a goal of using uniform tools.

A group home Performance Measures Task Group has been established to develop data definitions for measures in the current contract, refine undeveloped benchmarks, and consider additional measures. Simultaneously, the Work Group has begun to consider ways to address urgently needed improvements in the quality of current services, responding to recommendations made by youth in group homes.

Finally, members of the Work Group have been attending statewide meetings on group homes and rate restructuring, and have recommended that the County consider endorsing SB 1570, which has been introduced as a first step in the statutory changes necessary for statewide system reform. The Work Group is committed to continuing to collaborative planning around these transformations.

If you have any questions about these, please call me or your staff may contact Helen Berberian, Board Relations Manager at (213) 351-5530.

DS:LP:em

#### Attachments

c: Chief Administrative Officer  
County Counsel  
Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors



**Foundation for Los Angeles County's Utilization of  
Residentially Based Services (RBS) for Children**  
March 31, 2006

*A New Understanding of the Role of Residentially-Based Services: Key Elements*

1. Children and youth requiring out-of-home placement should be cared for in the *most appropriate least restrictive setting* possible, preferably at home with their own parents or relatives. Los Angeles County will remain committed to making *individualized, case-by-case, placement decisions* that consider first and foremost each child and family's specific strengths and needs.
2. Residential treatment capacity will continue be needed in Los Angeles County as one element in the continuum of community-based services for at-risk children and youth and their families. However, the amount of RBS capacity that is needed in Los Angeles County may vary over time according to the individualized needs of children and families, the availability of alternative resources, and individual departmental goals. Therefore, the County shall remain committed to ongoing coordinated and collaborative planning efforts involving referring agencies, contracted RBS providers, parents, youth, advocates and other partners in the services continuum of care.
3. Residentially based services shall be utilized only under specific circumstances, namely when a young person's needs cannot be effectively and/or safely met in a family setting.
4. Youth who are consumers of residentially based services and their families shall be respected and fully engaged as partners in planning for permanency from the outset, and residential facilities will be open settings where families are actively encouraged to participate in treatment and planning.
5. Group homes shall be redefined as programs providing residentially-based services (RBS); that is, programs delivering behavioral and therapeutic interventions in congregate care settings -- not merely placements. In this conceptualization, "group home" as a *place to be* gives way to "residentially based services" as an *intervention* and means of achieving permanency.
6. In addition to providing treatment services, shelter and basic care, residentially based service programs shall attend to the holistic needs of placed youth, including their educational, developmental and recreational needs.
7. The role of residentially based service providers should be expanded to include responsibility for providing two new and critical categories of services which RBS providers are not currently authorized or funded to provide:
  - *Family support services* while young people are in a RBS program, to prepare families to be able to successfully care for their children when they are discharged; and,
  - *Post-discharge (a.k.a. aftercare) services* necessary to make sure that young people are able to remain with their families after they leave the group living arrangement.
8. A constellation of core services shall be available at all residential treatment programs. In addition there will be a need for RBS programs to specialize in particular medical, developmental, emotional, behavioral or other areas (e.g., for younger or older populations, those with chemical dependency, sexually acting out youth, and/or youth involved in the juvenile justice system).
9. The quality of residentially based services shall be monitored and ensured through the use of outcome measurement and performance-based contracting that focuses on RBS providers' track records in helping the young people they serve and their families achieve positive safety, permanency and well-being.



### *Assessment and Placement Decision Making*

- Prior to selection of RBS or any other type of non-emergency out-of-home placement, a thorough assessment of the strengths and needs of each child/youth and his/her family should be completed to determine the services needs and the most appropriate setting in which to provide these services (e.g., foster home, relative home, group home, etc).
- Assessment should involve the use of reliable standardized assessment protocols and instruments and, whenever possible, should involve input from multiple sources, including the child/youth, parents, and service providers.
- Appropriate assessment will discourage RBS from being inappropriately used as a “default option” simply because of a child/youth’s number of placements, age, or lack of identified permanency resources. Instead, RBS will be thoughtfully selected as the best possible intervention for a specific child/youth based on a comprehensive and holistic understanding of the child/youth’s strengths, needs and circumstances.
- Appropriate assessment, it is anticipated, will decrease the likelihood that children/youth in need of RBS will have this service withheld until they have experienced multiple placement failures in less restrictive settings. In other words, assessment will support a “first placement, best placement” policy and will curtail children having to “fail up” into a RBS program.
- The Needs and Services Plan for each child/youth will consistently and comprehensively document the reasons for placement, including the presence of circumstances or behaviors that prevent the youth from having his/her needs safely and effectively met in a family-like setting, the assessment of the youth’s treatment needs, services being provided and progress toward treatment goals.

### *Duration of Services*

- Residential treatment services will normally be designed to be intensive and short-term in duration, with the understanding that decisions about length of RBS intervention must be made on an individualized basis.
- RBS will typically be an interim resource, e.g., a short-term 3-9 month intervention, focused on returning youth to the community as soon as safely possible for the youth and community. However, research also indicates that certain residentially-based interventions require longer courses of treatment to be effective, e.g., treatment for sex offenders and alcohol or drug abuse. In addition, the specific needs and desires of particular children and families must be respected.
- Decisions to access or discontinue RBS for a child/youth should regularly be made as part of a treatment team discussion, involving the child/youth, family members, county personnel, RBS providers, and other providers whenever appropriate. [Exceptions are by order of the court or due to an immediate health or safety threat]. These decisions may take place in the context of Team Decision Making (TDM), Individualized Education Plan (IEP) meetings, or other kinds of case conferences.

### *Family Engagement and Permanency Planning*

- RBS providers will serve as “reconnection engines,” giving as much attention to their responsibility to facilitate permanence for consumers as they give to treatment and other goals.
- Decisions about replacing youth out of RBS programs shall no longer follow a ‘step down’ protocol that exposes children to multiple placement moves by replacing them into other temporary living situations simply because they are less restrictive. Rather, each child’s treatment team (including the youth and his/her family members) will collaboratively plan for placement transitions that result in youth leaving RBS programs to enter living situations that offer permanency, or a clear pathway toward permanency.



- The Needs and Services Plan for each child/youth will consistently address the permanency plan, and detail engagement with parents, siblings, relatives and extended family members, as well as significant relationships with other adults in the child/youth's life.

#### *Continuum of Care*

- Alternative resources, such as Multi-Dimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC), Wraparound, and Intensive Treatment Foster Care (ITFC), will be further developed to facilitate the provision of services to youth in non-residential settings whenever possible.
- Movements between placement settings and program types will be driven by the needs of families, rather than by funding streams.
- Every child or youth in residential care and their families will have access to aftercare services, transitional services, and when needed, respite services. RBS providers must be resourced and encouraged to play an important role in the provision of these services.

#### *Accountability, Performance Measurement and Outcomes*

- The County and RBS providers, parents, youth, and other stakeholders will work collaboratively to develop a reliable and robust performance evaluation system based on program standards and placements from DCFS, DMH and Probation.
- Performance measures will evaluate safety, permanence, and well-being, including treatment efficacy.
- Performance measures will go beyond process indicators to reflect the outcomes expected over time and will focus on outcomes that are within the control of the entities being evaluated.
- Performance and capacity utilization shall be connected once a reliable system for measuring performance has been identified.

#### *Rate Setting Structure and Other Payment/Financing Issues*

- In order to fund this 'full-service' vision of residential care, Los Angeles County will advocate with the State to reform the AFDC-Foster Care rate setting system so that the private nonprofit agencies operating group homes receive adequate funding to cover the reasonable costs of providing: (1) high quality care, supervision and treatment services to placed children; (2) support services to families to prepare them for reunification as quickly as possible; and (3) aftercare services and support in order to ensure that children leaving residential care facilities are able to remain living safely in a family setting.
- The state's group home rate setting structure, which is currently based on filled beds, rather than services provided or outcomes achieved, needs to be reformed. New models of payment for services need to be explored to incentivize the goals of child safety, permanency and well-being.
- Financial and other incentives that could be implemented under the current California rate setting system should be explored immediately. Optimally, reimbursement for services would be structurally tied to performance outcomes.

#### *Ongoing Coordinated and Collaborative Capacity Planning*

- Ongoing coordinated and collaborative planning efforts involving referring agencies, contracted RBS providers, parents, youth, advocates and other partners in the services continuum of care are critical to the successful implementation of this future vision and planning efforts will continue on a system-wide basis as well as with individual providers.



**Los Angeles County Residentially Based Services Work Group  
Report on Implementation and Transition Strategies  
March 31, 2006**

**Introduction**

At the March 15, 2005 Board meeting, the Board directed the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) to establish a "Children's Group Home Workgroup", in accordance with the "Katie A." settlement, to consist of representatives from, but not limited to, DCFS, Probation, Mental Health (DMH) and other relevant group home providers and consumers, to develop an array of implementation and transition strategies, including a proposed timeline for implementation, to service children with the goal of stability and permanency.

The Board's directed the Work Group to focus on how the County can maintain and better utilize the resources of agencies, when it decreases reliance on such agencies for residential placement of children; the status on proposals made on modifying the rate setting structure for group homes, including potential legislative changes that would positively impact this situation; and recommendations and findings.

The Work Group began meeting on April 26, 2005 and has met regularly since then. The Work Group includes representatives from DCFS, DMH, Probation, 18 large and small group home agencies serving various areas of Los Angeles County, the Commission for Children and Families, a parent representative, and former youth in care. An initial progress report was submitted to the Board of Supervisors on July 7, 2005. This report is a second progress report. The Work Group meets monthly.

The Work Group was established to assess the need for and role of group homes in the DCFS, DMH and Probation systems in a time when the goals and outcomes for these systems have been refocused, with a greater emphasis on in-home service provision, and faster permanency for children in out-of-home care. The following highlights and summarizes the discussions, issues and strategies covered during the Work Group meetings.

**Coordinated Planning between County Departments, Providers and Stakeholders**

The Work Group has been a valuable venue for coordinating capacity and services planning, as well as training activities to support change. Monthly capacity utilization reports including the number of youth placed from Los Angeles County, pending placements, and vacancies, are being collected and shared at the meetings.



The role of group home care has historically been different for DCFS, DMH and Probation. It is the highest level of care for DCFS and DMH, and a less restrictive level of care for Probation, compared to Juvenile Camps.

Consistent with DCFS's goals to reduce reliance on out-of-home care, especially for children age 12 and younger in group homes, and to shorten timelines to permanence for children in out-of-home care, the number of DCFS children in group homes has been declining. In contrast, there has been an increase in the number of Probation youth in group homes, which is consistent with Probation's plan to serve more younger youth in its Suitable Placement Program instead of its Camp Program. There has been an increase over time in the number of youth placed by DMH, however DMH does not have a plan to greatly increase its utilization pattern. DMH uses group home resources exclusively through its AB 3632 program, which is voluntary and relies on Individualized Education Plan (IEP) Teams, rather than DMH staff, to recommend it for a subset of disabled children in need of special education services.

The Work Group has developed a document summarizing a shared vision for a transformed role of group homes (a.k.a. residentially based services for children) in Los Angeles County. The "Foundation for Los Angeles County's Residentially Based Services Reform" summarizes the key elements that the Work Group recommends should govern the County's utilization of residentially-based services (RBS) in the future.

This implies a significant transition from the historical utilization of group homes to a completely different model. While there will be an ongoing need for residential capacity for children and youth who cannot be served in community based settings, the new system will need to be more skilled at treatment, respectful and engaging of families, committed to faster permanency, and integrally linked to community based services. This RBS transition could take 3-5 years, and will depend as much on stakeholder collaboration as on statutory or regulatory changes. The Work Group has chosen to rename itself the Residentially Based Services Work Group to begin to model the vision of the new system. This foundation for reform presents an opportunity to engage all stakeholders in the transition process and in the creation of a Transition Plan.

### **Public/Private Summits and Training**

On December 12, 2005, DCFS held a Residentially Based Services Leadership Summit, at which over 200 managers and supervisors from DCFS, DMH, Probation and Group Home agencies met with other stakeholders to introduce system transformation concepts, and collaborate on system improvement and redesign. This generated a robust list of proposals to guide the Work Group in its effort improve the effectiveness and outcomes of residentially based services. Recommendations ranged from major system changes to those able to be implemented more immediately, and many were consistent with efforts already underway. The Work Group has identified a priority set



of these recommendations and immediate improvements to concentrate on and will be including these in a Transition Plan.

The DCFS Training Section, in conjunction with the LA Training Consortium, has developed a series of Group Home Summits for supervisors entitled: "Building Bridges: Creating New Opportunities for Public-Private Collaboration in Planning for Group Home Services for Children and their Families." These will bring together DCFS SCSWs, Probation Officers, Mental Health staff and Group Home staff who develop Needs & Service plans for child clients. These local level summits are intended to focus on the cross systems collaboration needed to create and implement successful service plans, and will be held between March and July 2006.

### **Current Group Home Capacity Utilization and Historical Trends**

As of March 1, 2006, the DCFS census of children and youth placed in group homes was 1739. As of March 3, 2006, there were 1317 Probation youth placed in group homes. In January 2006, there were 541 children and youth placed by DMH in group homes. Since 1999, DCFS placements in group homes have declined, and DMH and Probation placements have increased. Data about these trends are attached to this report (**Attachment #1**).

### **Business Conversion**

In this fluid environment, as some group home programs have made the decision to stop offering residentially based services, the Departments have identified and begun to put in place some transition strategies. These include redirection of group homes that may only serve one Department to the other systems, and the expansion of contracted community based services to new providers.

It is now the policy of the Probation Department to work with younger youth and provide community based services unless a high level of supervision is warranted and the safety of the community is a major concern. Youth who are in need of removal from the home and who are 14 years and younger should be seriously considered for placement in least restrictive setting, consistent with the needs of the minor and the safety of the community. Evidenced based practice suggests that younger youth generally need more individualized attention and should not be exposed to older, more criminally sophisticated youth in a confined setting, such as juvenile camp. When removal from the home is necessary for those age 14 and younger, Suitable Placement in a group home is the first consideration by the Probation Out-Of-Home Screening Unit. Probation has now recruited the following providers to provide services specifically designed to address younger minors: Crittenton-Castle V House, Trinity-Apple Valley and Optimist.

### **Expansion of Community Based Services**



DCFS released a Request For Statement of Qualifications (RFSQ) to expand the Wraparound Services program, which has grown to serve 539 children by the end of February 2006. DCFS has projected approximately 800 slots for Wraparound services in FY 06-07. DCFS will award contracts by May 1, 2006. Approximately 35 providers applied, including the 8 current providers. Wraparound providers serve both DCFS and Probation youth. The Work Group will evaluate the potential need for additional Wraparound slots in FY 07-08 as an alternative to group home placements. The innovative Residential Wraparound model currently piloted at 4 group home agencies has demonstrated shortened timelines to permanency, and is one approach that seems very promising as a vehicle for the group home culture change envisioned in the RBS Foundation.

Additionally DCFS's Family Preservation program and the Partnership For Families, a program funded by First Five LA provided opportunities in 2005 and 2006 for child welfare services providers to start new or expand community-based services for families and children. Business conversions to community based services such as these can be large scale time-consuming efforts, which may include retraining, reorganizing and at times staff turnover.

DMH and DCFS submitted a plan for Enhanced Specialized Foster Care Mental Health Services (ESFCMHS) which was approved by the Board (what date), focused on the needs of children and youth in group homes and D-rate foster homes. New services contemplated include pilots for 80 Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC) beds, 80 slots for Multi-Systemic Therapy and 320 slots for Intensive In-Home Services. An RFSQ addendum to the MHSA RFSQ will be released this spring. Along with the Full Service Partnership slots that will be funded by the MHSA, these additional services for 480 youth will provide other opportunities for providers to serve children and their families in the community.

It is also likely that there will be further expansion of both wraparound services and treatment foster care in the near future. On March 14, 2006, the federal district court in Los Angeles ordered the state of California to provide mental health services that will enable tens of thousands of foster children to avoid institutional care. The order came in a three-year-old class action lawsuit known as Katie A. v. Bonta. The court set a 120-day time frame for the state to comply with its order.

### **Family Finding and Permanency**

The March 2005 Board of Supervisors motion included a focus on Hollygrove Children and Family Services, whose Board of Directors elected to stop offering residentially-based services by September 2005. Hollygrove identified a new framework for "Family Finding" and intensive family reconnection for hard-to-place children who have become disconnected from their extended families. Internet search technology and intensive training on family reconnection efforts led Hollygrove to successfully reconnect many and actually place a number of children with extended family members before they

RBS Work Group **Report on Implementation and Transition Strategies, March 31, 2006**



closed their program. Hollygrove has gotten private funds to continue family reconnection efforts for the children formerly at its residential program.

The DCFS Permanency Partners Program and the Metro North Regional Office are employing similar intensive family reconnection efforts. Five Acres has begun a process of employing family finding for 30 children in their programs who currently have few or no family connections. Five Acres is collaborating with EMQ, Hollygrove and DCFS on family finding, and has set a goal of finding a permanent involved adult for every child it serves by 2007. These pioneering efforts illustrate the focus on permanency the Work Group recommends for all residential programs.

### **Assessment and Placement**

The Work Group has recommended that prior to the selection of RBS a thorough assessment of strengths and needs be done using reliable standardized protocols and instruments.

The Probation Placement Assessment Center (PAC) is a new Pilot Program begun in 2005 and developed collaboratively with the Rancho San Antonio and Boys Republic Residential Treatment Programs, which conduct an intensive and comprehensive assessment within thirty (30) days. The Probation PAC assessment will identify treatment and behavioral concerns that need to be addressed and served prior to the case plan goal being completed. The PAC assessment will enable the Probation Officer to properly place a youth at a residentially based program that can best serve the child's needs.

The Multidisciplinary Assessment Team (MAT) is a collaborative effort between the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) and the Department of Mental Health (DMH), and other community providers. It is designed to ensure the immediate and comprehensive assessment of children and youth entering foster care through Emergency Response (ER).

Beginning in April 2006, DCFS will institute an assessment using the Child and Adolescent Needs and Services (CANS) tool by Resource Utilization Management (RUM) staff at replacement conferences (Team Decision Making conferences or TDMs) held for placements into Group Homes and replacements or discharges from Group Homes.

DCFS, DMH and Probation have established a joint committee to examine the various screens and assessment tools in use across programs, beginning with group home placements, in order to develop recommendations about using uniform tools and sharing information across systems. Additionally, the Work Group recommends that the Departments begin meeting to examine the feasibility of developing some type of modular cross-Departmental standardized format for service plans.



## **Accountability and Performance Measurement**

Beginning November 4, 2005 a new Group Home Performance Measures Task Group (PMTG) began meeting monthly to develop data definitions for the performance measures in the current contract, refine any undeveloped benchmarks, collect data, and consider additional measures. The PMTG is currently concentrating on creating the operational data definitions for the Group Home performance measures currently in the County contract. The PMTG has also recommended two additional safety measures, on the timeliness and full completion of corrective action plans when there are safety incidents identified.

In late 2005, California Youth Connection (CYC) led a series of Speak Outs! in Los Angeles for youth in care to provide input for an Assembly Select Committee On Foster Care. DCFS and Probation youth and staff attended. Out of these three events, and a follow-up Speak Out! held in January 2006, a list of recommendations from youth specific to their concerns with the services they receive in group homes was developed. Many of the observations consisted of accountability issues that the Work Group will develop a plan to systematically follow up on improving now, while also working on long term reform. The Departments are continuing to work with CYC on future regularly planned events, and the next Speak Out! will be held in April 2007.

## **Rate Setting Structure, Administration, and Financing Issues**

A new AFDC-Foster Care payment system for group homes will not necessarily result in an increase in overall AFDC-Foster Care expenditures. By authorizing and funding group homes to provide services and support to families while their children are still in placement and after they are discharged, it should be possible to reduce the average length of stay and to achieve better long-term outcomes which will reduce the incidence of re-entry into foster care. The savings achieved may offset the costs of providing adequate funding to group home providers.

The California Alliance has been leading a statewide stakeholders Work Group on reform of residentially –based services. This group has produced a “Framework for a New Vision of Residentially Based Services in California” and proposed legislation, SB 1570, as a first step in the transition to the new framework.

Members of the Los Angeles Work Group have been attending the statewide meetings, and the LA “RBS Foundation” is substantially complementary to the statewide “Framework.” The RBS Work Group recommends that Los Angeles County consider endorsing SB 1570, which has been introduced as a first step in considering the statutory changes necessary for statewide system reform.



## **Proposed Legislation: SB 1570**

SB 1570 advances a framework for transforming the current system of group home care into a more comprehensive new system of child-centered residentially-based services (RBS), intended to enhance services and expedite permanent family placement for children by reforming the way group homes are utilized, the range of services they offer and how they are reimbursed for these services. It directs the HHS Agency Interagency Child Welfare Services Team to craft a detailed plan to make the framework operational with input from stakeholders and assistance from an outside consultant for legislative consideration by July 1, 2008. SB 1570 authorizes the range of behavioral and/or therapeutic interventions necessary to overcome major obstacles to children living in their own homes or other stable family setting, including two new and critical categories of services which group homes are now not authorized or funded to provide:

- Family support services while the children are in the program to prepare families to be able to successfully care for the children when they are discharged.
- Post-discharge services necessary to make sure that children are able to remain with their families after they leave the group living arrangement.

It defines a number of major RBS program features to be fully fleshed out in the operational plan, including:

- Comprehensive up-front assessment of children by county placing agencies.
- Matching of individual children's needs with an appropriate RBS program.
- Involving the children and their families in decision-making.
- Ensuring quality facilities, programs, and services.
- Achieving permanency or stability in a family setting for children at discharge.
- Identifying and measuring outcomes for children and providers.
- Developing a new payment system that covers reasonable RBS costs associated with provision of necessary services.

SB 1570 authorizes individual counties and private nonprofit agencies to enter into voluntary agreements for cost-neutral pilot projects to test alternative RBS program designs and funding models for children referred from child welfare, juvenile justice, mental health and substance abuse systems. It provides protections necessary to ensure that RBS reforms do not increase State General Fund costs.

### **Next steps for the GHWG**

Over the next year, the Work Group has two goals, the creation of a 3-5 year Transition Plan with specific objectives and timelines for completion, and the creation of a short term Implementation Plan for system accountability improvements, with specific objectives and timelines for completion.

Attachment:

1999-2005 Data on Placement Trends



# Children Placed in Group Homes through the Los Angeles County Departments of Children and Family Services, Probation and Mental Health: July 1999 - July 2005

